

FARMINGTON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Thursday, September 9, 2004

PLANNING COMMISSION STUDY SESSION

Present: Vice-Chairman Roybal, Commission Members Keith Klundt, Bart Hill, John Montgomery, Kevin Poff, and Jim Talbot, City Planner David Petersen, and Deputy City Recorder Jeane Chipman. (Chairman Ritz was excused until later in the meeting.)

Vice-Chairman Roybal began the study session at 6:45. The study session had been scheduled to discuss the request by the Division of Motor Vehicles (DMV) to relocate their facility from the County Court House to 200 West, south of the Farmington Junior High. Several members of the Planning Commission had concerns regarding whether or not the DMV would draw increased traffic to the school zone that would impact student safety. Horrocks Engineers had been contacted and four of the Planning Commission members had met with the engineers on September 1. Those four Planning Commission members did not take a vote on September 1 regarding the DMV request because they wanted to have all members of the Commission informed and available for input.

Mr. Poff reported Horrocks Engineers had been asked directly if the potential traffic increase caused by the DMV would make a significant difference to 200 West. The engineers had responded that the increase would not have significant impact.

Mr. Montgomery explained his concern. The DMV had requested 78 parking stalls. City ordinances required about one-third that amount. If the facility actually required the 78 stalls, which they stated would be the case during their peak times, then there could be as many as 410 cars per hours during those peak hours added to the traffic going by the Farmington Junior High. If the DMV peak hours corresponded with the junior high's peak hours (drop off in the morning and pick up in the afternoon), the increase would be detrimental to the already congested traffic conditions being experienced at the school. The County's population will grow as will the City's, meaning the users of the DMV facility will increase along with traffic using 200 West. Mr. Montgomery felt the Planning Commission would be remiss if precautions were not taken to safeguard 200 West and protect school students. If a child was injured, citizens would be justified in asking why the City had not contemplated the danger.

Mr. Poff said Horrocks Engineers had been asked if a traffic study would provide any new information not already introduced to the Commission. The answer had been no.

Mr. Montgomery felt traffic studies and information already given had not concentrated on the school peak hours and the direct impact increased traffic from the DMV would have on the students during the morning and afternoon hours.

Mr. Poff noted information given the Planning Commission had shown that the Farmington Junior High experienced the least amount of traffic of any junior high in the District. He felt that the school area would be impacted a great deal by increased traffic due to growth in west Farmington. The DMV traffic would be insignificant comparatively.

Mr. Petersen explained plans to redo the State Street overpass and the impact it would eventually have on traffic using State Street and 200 West.

Ms. Roybal felt the Commission had to be sensitive to the school traffic conditions. Parking and traffic flow is currently very poor. Peak hours for the DMV would correspond with peak traffic hours of the school.

Mr. Klundt said that a traffic study would clarify traffic flows and numbers, not the risk impact on the school.

[Chairman Ritz arrived at 7:10 P.M.]

Mr. Petersen said that with the redesign of I-15 and the State Street overpass there may be eventual potential for access along the frontage road for the DMV facility. He also stated that he had been given information that the Weber County DMV was experiencing traffic problems. There were times when the waiting cue for the drive-up window was stacked into the street. Davis County DMV officials were adamant that the user numbers given in the request would remain flat even though the County would experience growth. The stable facility user numbers was due to internet registration increases and other options being promoted. He also stated that because of changes in the site plan, the DMV would need to assure cross easement parking approval with the Steven's Company.

Mr. Petersen also asked Commission members for permission to amend the agenda. Mr. Hirst, the City Engineer, had requested his presentation regarding traffic solutions for 1075 West and Shepard Lane be moved ahead on the agenda because of another engagement he needed to attend.

PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR SESSION

Present : Chairman Cory Ritz, Commission Members Keith Klundt, Bart Hill, John Montgomery, Kevin Poff, Cindy Roybal, and Jim Talbot, City Planner David Petersen, and Deputy City Recorder Jeane Chipman.

Chairman Ritz called the meeting to order at 7:15 P.M. **Kevin Poff** offered the invocation.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Kevin Poff moved that the Planning Commission approve the minutes of the August 26, 2004, Planning Commission Meeting. **John Montgomery** seconded the motion. The Commission voted unanimously in favor. **Chairman Ritz** abstained due to his absence during the August 26th meeting.

AMENDMENT TO THE AGENDA

Keith Klundt moved that the Planning Commission amend the agenda to consider Agenda Item #5b prior to Agenda Item #2. **Jim Talbot** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

1075 WEST/SHEPARD LANE ROUND-ABOUT (Agenda Item 5b)

Paul Hirst explained that the City was currently in the process of acquiring funding from the State to make improvements at the intersection of Shepard Lane and 1075 West. He said originally the City had planned to have a signal light at that location. There had been discussion of advantages and disadvantages of a round-about. As an engineer, Mr. Hirst was usually not in favor of round-about intersections. However, after study of unique problems at that intersection, he felt a round-about may be worth considering. Signals near the intersection will be located very close to each other. Having signals in such close proximity are a nuisance to traffic flow.

Jerry Rechtenbach presented a model of the proposed round-about project. The model showed that the round-about would likely fail by the year 2015 because of the added traffic from the proposed Buie project. Had the Buie project remained totally commercial, the round-about would have been sufficient. However, if the Buie project included an increase in residential units, the round-about would not be able to handle the load by the year 2015. If the round-about is approved, other options would have to be provided for access to and from the Buie project. Mr. Rectinhaulgh reviewed other such options. A signal at the Shepard Lane 1075 West intersection would still have a long cue especially coming from the west bound approach. It was suggested that the Buie property have a right-in, right-out access only to insure the round-about will work.

Mr. Hirst stated the City was under a deadline regarding the decision because requests for funding from the State were due within a few weeks.

The Planning Commission discussed the issue and asked questions, including the following points:

- The round-about would be a single lane traffic device. Surrounding features (fiber optic lines, power poles, homes) would make it very expensive to add a second lane.
- The City had received a grant to install a signal light at that location. The cost for the signal and the cost for the round-about were comparative.
- The round-about would act as a traffic calming device. Some Commission members asked if it would be best to calm (slow) the traffic or move it quickly out of the area.
- The round-about may have filled its useful purpose by the year 2015 and need to be replaced.
- If the round-about is approved, City officials must require specific traffic flow designs regarding the Buie project in order to move traffic from the Buie project away from Shepard Lane.

Chairman Ritz asked for initial reactions from each Commission Member. Mr. Talbot was in favor of the round-about, considering it was the City Engineer's recommendation. Mr. Hill and Mr. Klundt agreed. Mr. Montgomery felt he would like to see a model for the signal in order to compare the two options and then make an informed judgement. Mr. Poff felt a need for more information before a decision was made. Ms. Roybal agreed with Mr. Montgomery. Chairman Ritz was in favor of the around about.

PUBLIC HEARING: FARMINGTON CITY REQUEST FOR A RECOMMENDATION TO AMEND CHAPTER 11 OF THE GENERAL PLAN REGARDING COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT (MP-2-04) (Agenda Item #2)

David Petersen explained the request for a recommendation to amend language in Chapter 11 of the General Plan. He stated that in their review of the document, the City Council had inadvertently changed language in the Neighborhood Mixed Use (NMU) zone and made two statements somewhat ambiguous. The City Council had made the changes in an effort to ensure Main Street would remain primarily residential. The advisory committee and citizen input indicated a strong public feeling that Main Street should remain residential. Mr. Petersen reviewed the specific changes as contained in the packet.

Public Hearing

Chairman Ritz opened the meeting to a public hearing.

Public Hearing Closed

With no forthcoming comments, **Chairman Ritz** closed the public hearing.

Motion

Keith Klundt moved that the Planning Commission recommend the City Council approve language changes to the Neighborhood Mixed Use Zone in Chapter 11 of the General Plan as presented. **John Montgomery** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Findings

- The language changes reflected the original intent of the advisory committee, the citizen input received, the Planning Commission discussions, and stated goals of the City Council.
- The current language had created inadvertent inconsistencies in the General Plan text. The amendment would clarify the language.

SAM BRADY ARCHITECTS REQUEST FOR SITE PLAN APPROVAL TO CONSTRUCT A BUILDING FOR THE DIVISION OF MOTOR VEHICLES (DMV) LOCATED APPROXIMATELY A BLOCK WEST OF 200 WEST AT 200 SOUTH IN A BP ZONE (C-10-04) (Agenda Item #3)

Background Information

This agenda item was reviewed by the Planning Commission on August 12, 2004. The Planning Commission tabled the application in order to allow time for the developer to resolve a number of issues outlined in the enclosed letter from David Petersen to Tom Stuart Construction dated August 18, 2004. Architectural elevations of the building were reviewed at the last Planning Commission meeting and the developer has submitted a site plan which has been reviewed by City staff. The applicant is proposing to break up the blank surfaces on some of the building elevations with trees and other landscape material. The developer is proposing to landscape 12.6% of the entire site. The Zoning Ordinance requires 15% of the site to be landscaped. However, the developer's landscape area does not include the .25 acres of wetlands along the western boundary of the project area and the Zoning Ordinance allows the Planning Commission flexibility to reduce the landscape percentage, if due to the size of the parcel, the amount landscaping required is unreasonable and cannot be located in useful locations. City staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve the landscape plan as prepared by the applicant.

Traffic is a major issue regarding this application. It may be very difficult for the developer to prepare a study with accurate traffic counts because the Park Lane interchange is still under construction and a detour is directing an inordinate amount of traffic up West State Street to the center of town. The applicant did provide a letter from Wilbur Smith Associates regarding the DMV building. The Wilbur Smith letter provides some insight about trips generated by the facility and the distribution of trips. No estimates, however, are provided about the percentage of trips coming from North Davis County versus South Davis County, nor does the conclusion discuss the number of North Davis County trips that will use Lagoon Drive versus Main Street. This may or may not be a problem. The Wilbur Smith letter has been forwarded to the Farmington City Transportation Engineers for their recommendation. City staff will also provide more information regarding traffic at the Planning Commission meeting.

END OF PACKET MATERIAL.

Mr. Petersen stated the agenda item had been discussed in some depth during the open study session held by the Planning Commission just prior to the regular session. All requirements had been met by the applicant with the exception of the traffic study and the improvement plans. A discussion of the issues ensued, including the following points:

- Mr. Montgomery referred to information given the Planning Commission regarding traffic at other junior highs in the District. He noted that it seemed other junior high schools were not being impacted by traffic during their peak hours. He felt strongly that the Planning Commission needed specific information regarding the increased traffic for the DMV facility during peak hours for both the DMV and the school and the interplay between the two. He also felt that the traffic increase may be more than the DMV has currently divulged, as reflected by the request for 78 parking stalls.
- Mr. Poff felt the traffic increase of greatest concern was the traffic that would be coming from the growth in west Farmington. The DMV traffic in comparison would be fairly insignificant.
- Ms. Roybal asked if the Planning Commission could receive information regarding the Weber County DMV. That facility was currently having a negative impact on surrounding traffic flow because the cue line backed into the street.
- Mr. Petersen reported the reciprocal parking agreement between the DMV and the Steven's Company would have to be assured before final approval.

Motion

Keith Klundt moved that the Planning Commission deny site plan approval to construct a building for the Division of Motor Vehicles (DMV) located at approximately 200 West and 200 South. **John Montgomery** seconded the motion.

A roll call vote was taken. Mr. Poff, Mr. Hill, and Mr. Talbot were opposed to the motion. Mr. Klundt, Mr. Montgomery, and Ms. Roybal were in favor. Chairman Ritz broke the tie with a vote in opposition, stating it was his conviction that in a tie vote, the swing vote should side with the opposition. The motion failed by a 4 to 3 vote.

Mr. Montgomery moved that the Planning Commission table consideration of the request for site plan approval to construct a building for the Division of Motor Vehicles (DMV) located at approximately 200 West and 200 South until the Commission received answers to questions that had been asked since the application was first submitted, namely information related to traffic increases and the impact on school peak hours in the morning and afternoon and specifics regarding the utilization of 78 parking stalls when that number is three times the typical need for similar businesses. Mr. Montgomery also asked for information about cue lines for drive-up windows and resultant impact on surrounding traffic flows. He stated that failure to receive and consider such information, in his opinion, could expose the City to liability regarding the safety of junior high school students. **Cindy Roybal** seconded the motion.

In discussion of the motion, **Mr. Talbot** asked that Mr. Montgomery clarify the motion because a traffic engineer had given a professional opinion regarding the increased traffic thus the applicant had complied with the request. Horrocks Engineers had stated they would not be opposed to the traffic conditions created by the DMV relocation.

Mr. Montgomery stated the intent of his motion was to gain information regarding the impact of the increased traffic due to the relocation of the DMV specifically during Farmington Junior High School peak times. He also wanted to know why the DMV was requesting the 78 parking spaces when City ordinances only required one-third that amount.

Mr. Poff reported it had been his understanding that Horrock Engineers had been asked to respond to inquiries about the school's peak hours and impact resulting from the DMV traffic, and the engineers felt the increase impact was within acceptable limits.

A roll call vote was taken. Ms. Roybal, Mr. Montgomery, Mr. Hill, and Mr. Klundt were in favor of the motion. Mr. Poff and Mr. Talbot were opposed. The motion to table the agenda item passed by a 4 to 2 vote.

DAVIS COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT BUS COMPOUND/CONSIDERATION OF FINDINGS OF FACT (C-5-04) (Agenda Item #4)

Mr. Poff and **Mr. Hill** declared a conflict of interest regarding the agenda item and recused themselves from participation with the Planning Commission for the agenda item.

Mr. Petersen reviewed a draft letter to the City Council. The letter responded to the City Council's request for additional facts to support the Commission's findings regarding the Commission's denial of the Davis County School District request to locate a bus compound in west Farmington. Mr. Petersen stated the Planning Commission should review the letter and consider authorizing the Chairman to sign the letter. It was Mr. Petersen's suggestion that the letter be reviewed by the City Attorney and, pending that review, be forwarded to the City Council along with the minutes of the last Planning Commission meeting wherein the findings were discussed in detail.

By consensus, the Commission members expressed their opinions that the letter reflected their discussion of the facts regarding the request for the west Farmington bus compound. They felt the letter presented sound arguments and that the minutes represented their discussion.

Chairman Ritz stated the request would not have been considered had it been a commercial entity. The only reason it was given the amount of attention it received was in deference to the School District.

Mr. Talbot expressed the fact that there was ample room in designated industrial areas that could more appropriately handle the bus compound. There was an added expense for the District to local and purchase other property, but the economics of the situation did not constitute reason enough to allow the industrial use in a rural, residential area.

Mr. Montgomery felt that until a school is constructed on the property, the use would be solely industrial.

Mr. Petersen stated that if and when the school is constructed, the compound use could be reconsidered and determination could be made whether or not it was an appropriate accessory use. He asked that the Planning Commission consider authorizing the Chairman to sign the letter pending review by the City Attorney. He felt after the Attorney had given input, the Chairman could reexamine the document and if there were significant changes the letter could be brought back to the Planning Commission.

Motion

Jim Talbot moved that the Planning Commission authorize Chairman Ritz to sign the proposed letter to the City Council which provided additional facts supporting the Commission's findings related to their denial of the School District's request for a bus compound in west Farmington subject to review of the City Attorney and that the letter should thereafter be forwarded to the City Council at the discretion of the Chairman and the City Planner. **Cindy Roybal** seconded, the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

[Mr. Hill was excused at 9:00 P.M.]

MISCELLANEOUS, CORRESPONDENCE, CITY COUNCIL REPORT (Agenda Item #5)**Commercial Development Proposal by Rulon Gardner**

Mr. Petersen introduced Rulon Gardner of the Gardner Development Company. Mr. Gardner had a proposal for property west of Main Street in the far north of Farmington. The presentation was for discussion only.

Mr. Gardner and his associates presented information regarding a proposed mixed use community commercial center which they felt would be consistent with the recently approved Chapter 11 of the General Plan. They wanted to make the Planning Commission aware of the proposal and gain input regarding the idea. The name of the center would be Cherry Hill Village. It would be developed with "new urbanism" in mind, which meant that it would be a pedestrian friendly, mixed use center not intended as a regional commercial draw. Similar projects included the Sugarhouse Commons, Draper Peaks, and the South Jordan Town Center. Possible tenants included a neighborhood grocer, boutiques, restaurants, office and service uses. Site plans showed a water feature in the center of the project, walkways throughout, and two major entrances designed to keep as much traffic off of Main Street as possible. One entrance would be directly across from the Somerset Farms entrance and was intended to be a signaled entrance to help alleviate current traffic problems at that location. The development was designed to be sensitive to the Main Street residential feel. Main Street would be buffered by park like landscaping, maintaining the current slope of the property. The commercial uses would be lower than the street. The only roof top that would be higher in elevation than Main Street would be the two story building. The developer intended to retain the old historic coach house and make it part of the northern entrance. The developer stated that it would be necessary to have enough commercial entities to make the project viable. They would also be supportive of the Smiths commercial center just to the south of the property. It was planned that there would be approximately 150,000 square feet of commercial space. There were also plans for condominiums. Two-thirds of the parking would be near the U.S. 89 corridor. The developers

planned to approach the citizens of the nearby neighborhoods and get their input regarding the project. They would also contact the owners of the Cherry Hill recreational facility to get their input regarding the proposed name.

Mr. Montgomery expressed his thoughts that the City had to look for the best use for the ground. It was his opinion that use would likely not be residential. However, public sentiment and reaction, as proven by past experience, would likely be very strong against this type of development. The General Plan indicated that nothing of this type would be allowed along Main Street.

Earl Kemp (one of the Gardner associates) commented that tenants are very careful where they locate. The development being presented was not intended to give competition to the larger commercial center being proposed for west Farmington. It was intended as a local, pedestrian-friendly center that had very low traffic impact. The developer had looked at Chapter 11 and felt that the center met all requirements of the General Plan for the property. Mr. Kemp felt that if this type of commercial center did not work on this property being proposed, it would not work anywhere in Farmington.

Mr. Klundt felt the signaled intersection at the Somerset entrance may well be an advantage.

Mr. Poff felt the plan would fit the elements of Chapter 11 and would help buffer residential uses from the commercial and from the nearby high traffic corridors. It also fit with the Smith's commercial center nearby.

Mr. Kemp stated that the park like buffer along Main Street would include a trail connection to nearby systems.

Ms. Roybal felt that the City needed to present the idea that Farmington is open to commercial development. This project may be contrary to the feelings of the local residents but may be ideal for the benefit of Farmington as a whole. Based on past experience, the opinions of the local residents may be a substantial hurdle.

Mr. Kemp stated that if the City insisted that homes be placed along Main Street in that area they would have to be built with the back of the homes to the street because of access problems. That would mean a double row of homes with a street for access on the west side of the homes. There would be a row of homes between two roads. The back of the homes would likely be walled for privacy. The Main Street esthetics would be compromised. The developer was proposing a 150 foot wide park instead.

Mr. Klundt felt that the proposal would provide a park for the City along Main Street, save mature trees, maintain and renovate an historic home, and include architectural support for the historic nature of the City.

Chairman Ritz felt the neighborhood opinion would be the developers' biggest problem. The signal at the Somerset entrance would be a great benefit to the neighborhood.

Oakridge Clubhouse Matters

Mr. Petersen explained a request by the Oakridge Country Club officials to amend the August 12, 2004, Conditional Use Permit for the demolition and new construction work for the clubhouse, swimming pool, and related facilities. The amendment was being requested to allow three temporary trailers on the Club property while the new building was being constructed. The trails would house their business offices and other essential facilities. Mr. Petersen recommended approval conditional on having the Oakridge Country Club follow all elements of the international building code. The trailers would be removed when the new club house was completed. Demolition was planned to begin around October 15. The new building was planned to be completed in May or June of 2005.

The Planning Commission discussed the proposal. Commission members asked that the trailers be made to look as esthetically pleasing as possible.

Motion

Kevin Poff moved that the Planning Commission amend the August 12, 2004, Conditional Use Permit granted the Oakridge Country Club for demolition and new construction work for the Oakridge Country Clubhouse, swimming pool, and related facilities as requested subject to requirements of the international building code, the removal of all three trailers within 10 days of issuance of the certificate of occupancy, and all requirements issued by City Staff and that special care be take with regards to esthetics of the trailers in consideration of the surrounding neighborhood. It was anticipated as part of the motion that construction of the new clubhouse would be completed within one year of this approval date. **Keith Klundt** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Planning Conferences

Mr. Petersen noted the up-coming conference being held by the Utah League of Cities and Towns. Planning Commission members were invited to attend and should contact the City Offices if they wished to be registered.

City Council Meeting

The City Council approved rezone for property near Woodland Park for the purpose of allowing a cell phone tower to be constructed on the property.

The City Council approved the schematic plan which would allow the expansion of the Miller Meadows Subdivision (86 lots) by adding 21 lots and by adding the Roberta Donahue property.

The City Council approved the schematic plan for a two-lot subdivision at the south end of Davis Creek Drive (50 East) south and adjacent to Creekside Subdivision within the Davis Creek Drainage Area on property owned by Herald Rice.

The City Council approved schematic plan and minor plat approval to develop a flag lot at 236 West 900 North. Approval was granted due to the topographical conditions of the property.

The City Council approved Phase I of the Eagle Creek Subdivision as requested by Mike Brown.

Mr. Petersen explained the situation with developments in west Farmington being impacted by the flood plane and requirements for a letter of map revision from FEMA. He was confident the developer of the Farmington Creek Estates would receive the letter of map revision. The eventual goal of the County was to remove the flood plane designation from the entire area of west Farmington by improvements on Farmington Creek and other drainage engineering. The City Council approved the amendment to the Farmington Creek Estates Development Agreement permitting recordation of plat prior to receipt of FEMA's Letter of Map Revision.

Mr. Petersen explained Mr Salmon's request to amend City ordinances restricting the reconstruction of structures with more than 50 percent damage. Mr. Salmon owned a duplex at 431 North Main Street. The area had recently been rezoned to OTR. The City's provision regarding damaged, non-conforming buildings in zones had been part of the Zoning Ordinance since the late 1960s. Mr. Salmon had been asked by City staff to gather ordinances and provisions from other cities regarding how they deal with non-conforming uses when properties and buildings are substantially damaged.

By consensus, the City Council gave direction to staff to move forward on the possible sale of property adjacent to Heritage Park. The next step would be a public hearing. Notification would be sent to the Heritage Park neighbors within 300 feet of the property.

Ms. Roybal mentioned that it would be of little benefit to improve the football field in South Park. Those participating in the football program are very unhappy with the east/west alignment of the football field in that Park. She mentioned also that the traffic at South Park during football games would be much more than the Heritage Park area could safety manage.

Chairman Ritz asked the City Planner to investigate the situation with the house located in the Farmington Creek Estates that was in critical disrepair and which presented safety hazards for the neighborhood.

Mr. Poff suggested that the addressing system for Farmington Station be investigated. It presented a problem when emergency response personnel cannot locate the addresses they need because of the unusual addressing system used by the Station.

ADJOURNMENT

John Montgomery moved that the Planning Commission adjourn at 9:40 P.M.

Cory Ritz, Chairman
Farmington City Planning Commission